

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated January 23, 2009, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-17, 25-27, 30-34, 36-40, and 50 are currently pending and subject to examination. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 10, 25, 34, and 50 have been amended. Claims 18-22 and 42-46 were previously withdrawn. Claims 4, 5, 11, 23-24, 28-29, 35, 47-49, and 51-53 were previously canceled. No new matter has been added.

#### **I. Allowed Claims**

Claims 12-17 and 36-41 are indicated allowed.

#### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

Claims 34 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 34 and 50 have been amended to overcome the above rejection. In particular, Claim 50 is amended to include a feature of "saving a restricted version of the electronic book, the restricted version including content from the original format of the electronic book but having the restricted content deleted, wherein the restricted version maintains the original format of the electronic book." Applicants respectfully submit that the restricted version does not change the original format of the electronic book but only deleting the restricted portion

from the original content of the electronic book. One example of a restricted version can be seen in Fig. 30c and 30f of the present application.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. If any further amendment is required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned representative.

## **II. 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 6-10, 25-26, and 30-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,298,441 to Handelman et al. ("Handelman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,667 to Duga et al. ("Duga"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,890,177 to Moody et al. ("Moody") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,553,216 to Yoshioka. ("Yoshioka"). Claims 3 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Handelman in view of Duga in view of Moody in further view of Yoshioka and in further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,384 to Block et al ("Block"). Claim 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,761,681 to Huffman et al. ("Huffman") in view of Handelman, Moody, and Yoshioka. It is noted that Claims 1, 10, 25, 34, and 50 have been amended. To the extent that the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicant hereby traverses the rejection, as follows.

The Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in the cited prior art, taken alone or in combination (propriety of which is not admitted), discloses or suggests a method for restricting access to electronic books displayed on a viewer that comprises at least the combination of features of "the unrestricted version including the original format of the electronic book, creating a restricted version and saving the restricted version of the

electronic book in at least one of the library unit and the viewer, the restricted version including content from the original format of the electronic book and having portions of the original content deleted, the deletions based on the identification of restricted content from the user, wherein the restricted version maintains the original format of the electronic book,” as recited in amended Claim 1, and similarly recited in amended Claims 10, 25, 34, and 50.

Handelman allows a portion of the document to be viewed or only allowing the document to be viewed in a certain format, such restrictions being based typically on parental control limits.

Duga describes that “a digital content stored in one endian format at the virtual bookstore can be directly used by one group of viewing devices, but must be converted to a different endian format to be used by the other group.” Duga, at col. 1, lines 63-67. Moody allows each of more than one editor edits his own document copy using an editing application program; however, Moody fails to teach or suggest storing restricted version of the document. Further, none of Huffman, Block, and Yoshita teaches or suggests a restricted version including content from the original format of the electronic book and having portions of the original content deleted and the restricted version maintains the original format of the electronic book. Accordingly, none of Huffman, Duga, Moody, Block, and Yoshita cures the deficiency of Handelman.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that amended Claims 1, 10, 25, 34, and 50 are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 2-3, 6-9, 26-27, and 30-33, which depend on allowable independent Claims 1, 10, and 25, are likewise allowable at least for the reasons stated above and the additional features recited therein.

### **CONCLUSION**

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into allowable form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, with reference to Attorney Docket No. 026680-00029.

Respectfully submitted,



Wan-Ching Montfort  
Registration No. 56,127

**Customer No. 004372**

1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Telephone No. (202) 857-6000  
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395